

Remarks/Arguments

A. Pending Claims

Claims 1-153 are rejected. Claims 81, 90, 95, 105, 115, 130, 139 and 144 are amended herewith. Claims 1-153 are pending in the case.

B. The Claims Are Definite Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action included a rejection of claim 90 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office Action asserts that the limitation “[t]he user for the security to be traded, then order preferences presented comprise at least” is unclear, and poses the question “Do Applicants mean ‘the user for the security to be traded, the order preferences presented comprise at least’ or ‘the user for the security to be traded, then the order preferences comprise at least’?”

Applicant has amended claims 90, 115 and 139 for clarification. The amended claims recite a combination of features that include “wherein if no security-specific order preferences have been received from the user for the security to be traded, then the order preferences presented comprise at least one generic order preference.” Applicant submits that the claim is definite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and respectfully requests the removal of the rejection on these grounds.

C. The Claims Are Not Obvious Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action includes rejections of claim 81-153 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,505,174 granted to Keiser et al. (hereinafter “Keiser”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,297,031 granted to Guttermann et al. (hereinafter “Guttermann”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

In order to reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner et al.*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173, 177-178 (CCPA 1967). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974), MPEP § 2143.03.

Applicant has amended claim 81. Amended claim 81 recites a combination of features that include: receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference; storing at least one generic security order preference in a memory. The Office Action asserts that column 2, lines 57-60, column 8, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 14-20 of Keiser teach at least some of the features of claim 81.

A cited section of Keiser recites:

Generally, both the client computers 12 and the server computers 14 are comprised of one or more CPUs 16, various amounts of RAM storing computer programs 20 and other data, and other components typically found in computers. In addition, both the client computers 12 and the server computers 14 may include one or more monitors, and fixed or removable data storage devices 20 such as hard disk drives, floppy disk drives, and/or CD-ROM drives. Also, input devices, such as mouse pointing devices and keyboards, may be included. (Keiser, Col. 8, lines 25-34).

Keiser further recites:

Block 206 is a decision block that represents the server computer 14 determining whether it received a request to submit a buy order from the client computer 12 for a particular derivative financial instrument, e.g., stock or bond. If so, block 208 represents the server computer 14 processing the buy order by placing it in a queue in the memory of the server computer 14. The buy order is a data structure comprising:

trader's account number;
trader's name;

the time and date of the order;
the stock or bond to buy;
the cash balance in the trader's account; and
a text-field where the trader may enter the total number to buy (generally in multiples of 100).

In a first preferred embodiment, the buy order waits in the queue for the expiration of a predetermined "sweep pricing cycle." The sweep pricing cycle occurs periodically, such as every 15 minutes, or during another specified time interval. The marked price the trader actually pays for the derivative financial instrument is determined by the aggregate supply/demand for the derivative financial instrument at the end of the sweep pricing cycle during which the order was placed. (Keiser, Col. 9, lines 14-37).

Applicant submits that neither the above-cited sections of Keiser, nor Keiser's specification, fail to teach or suggest the feature of storing at least one generic security order preference in a memory. Rather, Keiser appear to teach client or server computers that include one or more fixed or removable data storage devices (e.g., hard disk drives, floppy disk drives, and/or CD-ROM drives). Keiser appears to further teach a server computer receiving a request to submit a buy order from a client computer, and processing the buy order by placing it in a queue in the memory of the server. The data structure of the buy order the server computer receives from the client computer includes trader's account number, trader's name, the time and date of the order, the stock or bond to buy, the cash balance in the trader's account, and a text-field where the trader may enter the total number to buy.

Regarding storing at least one generic security order preference in a memory, Applicant's Specification recites:

In one embodiment, order preferences for securities are entered by a user and are stored on a computer system for future use as default values in response to the user placing an order. The user may adjust any or all of the default values at the time of order placement. The time that it takes to complete an order may potentially be reduced through the use of previously selected order preferences being displayed to the user in the order placement window. (Specification, page 2, lines 17-22).

The Specification further recites:

Figure 3 shows an embodiment of the system and method for computerized trading of securities. As shown in Figure 3, according to one embodiment, a user may be prompted to enter one or more security-specific order preferences for each of one or more securities in step 201. As used herein, an “order preference” is a default value to be used in response to a user placing an order for a security. In step 202, the one or more security-specific order preferences may be stored in a memory on a computer system (e.g., on a user’s computer or on a server). In step 203, the one or more security-specific order preferences may be used as default values in response to the user placing an order for one of the one or more securities.

Figure 4 shows an embodiment of the system and method for computerized trading of securities. As shown in Figure 4, according to one embodiment, a user may be prompted to enter one or more generic order preferences for a generic security in step 211. In step 212, the one or more generic order preferences may be stored in a memory on a computer system. In step 213, the one or more generic order preferences for the generic security may be used as default values for all orders for securities without corresponding security-specific order preferences. (Specification, page 5, last full paragraph-page 6, first full paragraph).

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that Keiser fails to teach or suggest the feature of storing at least one generic security order preference in a memory.

The Office Action asserts Keiser fails to teach the feature of automatically using at least one generic security order preference as a default value in response to a user placing an order for at least one security for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined, but that Column 4, lines 32-53 of Guttermann teach this feature. The Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Guttermann with the teachings of Keiser to arrive at the combination of features recited in claim 81. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Amended claim 81 recites a combination of features that further include: automatically using a stored generic security order preference as a default value in response to a user placing an order for at least one security for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined. Applicant respectfully submits that Guttermann fails to teach or suggest automatically using a

stored generic security order as a default in the context of amended claim 81. Rather, the cited section of Guttermann appears to teach “alternative orders” and “scale orders”.

Guttermann recites:

“Alternative orders” provide for one of two possible executions: a customer may order 5,000 bushels of corn at \$1.45 a bushel and 5,000 bushels of wheat at \$2.56 a bushel, but not want both. A far more common example of the alternative order is the placing of an objective and a stop, with instructions to cancel one if the other is filled; for example, having bought one contract of soybean oil at 14.50 cents a pound, a customer may order his broker to sell the oil either at 14.95 or 14.25 cents stop, whichever occurs first, and then immediately cancel the remainder of the order to avoid inadvertently reversing his position. “Scale orders” are used to establish or liquidate positions as the market moves up or down. The sugar trader may instruct his broker to buy a contract of sugar at 5.45 cents and another contract each time the price drops five points from that level until he has accumulated six contracts. When he sells out his position, he may order the broker to sell one contract at 5.70 cents and another contract each time the price rises five points until his six contracts have been sold. (Guttermann, Col. 4, lines 32-53).

Regarding automatically using at least one generic security order preference as a default value in response to a user placing an order for at least one security for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined, Applicants’ Specification recites:

Figure 7 shows steps that may illustrate submitting an order for execution through the use of an order placement window, according to one embodiment. In step 241, the user may be prompted to enter the security symbol. In step 242, the order preferences previously selected by the user in the order preferences window may be presented in the order placement window as default values. By automatically presenting previously selected order preferences based on the security symbol entered, the order entry may be completed relatively rapidly. Speed of order execution is an important aspect for securities trading, particularly for day trading. (Specification, page 10, lines 14-21).

In light of the above arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Keiser nor Guttermann, taken alone or in combination, appear to teach or suggest the combination features found in amended claim 81.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 82 in view of Keiser and Guttermann. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 82 includes the feature of receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference comprises presenting a generic security order preferences window to the user, wherein the generic security order preferences window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to specify at least one generic security order preference for securities for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons cited above, the cited references do not teach or suggest the features in claim 81 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 82.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 83 in view of Keiser and Guttermann. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 83 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a number of shares to be used as a default if no security-specific default number of shares is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 83 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 83.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 84 in view of Keiser and Guttermann. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 84 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a dollar amount of a transaction to be used as a default if no security-specific default dollar amount is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 84 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 84.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 105 in view of Keiser and Guterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Amended claim 105 recite a combination of features that include: A system comprising at least one computer system coupled to a network; at least one memory couple to the computer system; wherein at least one memory comprises program instructions; wherein the program instructions are executable by at least one computer system, in combination with many of the features of amended claim 81. The Office Action asserts that Column 8, lines 13-17, 25-29 and 35-44 of Keiser teach these features. The Office Action further states “[t] his independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 81.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

For at least the reasons cited above regarding the rejection of claim 81, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Keiser and Guterman fail to teach or suggest the combination of features found in amended claim 105. Applicant asserts that Keiser fails to teach at least the features of receive input comprising at least one generic security order preference and storing at least one generic security order preference in at least one memory. Applicant further asserts that Guterman fails to teach at least the feature of automatically using a stored generic security order preference as a default value in response to a user placing an order for at least one security for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the obviousness rejection of claim 105.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 85 in view of Keiser and Guterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 85 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a limit price to be used as a default if no security-specific default limit price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 85 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 85.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 86 in view of Keiser and Guttermann. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 86 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a trailing stop price to be used as a default if no security-specific default trailing stop price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 86 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 86.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 87 in view of Keiser and Guttermann. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 87 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a stop loss price to be used as a default if no security-specific default stop loss price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 87 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 87.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 88 in view of Keiser and Guttermann. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 88 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a lot indicator to be used as a default if no security-specific default lot indicator is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 88 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 88.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 89 in view of Keiser and Guttermann. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 89 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a lot indicator to be used as a default if no security-specific default lot indicator is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or

suggest the features in claim 89 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 89.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 90 in view of Keiser and Gutterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 90 includes the features of presenting an order placement window to the user;; prompting the user to enter a security symbol of a security to be traded; presenting order preferences received from the user in the order preferences window as default values, wherein if no security-specific order preferences have been received from the user for the security to be traded, then the order preferences presented comprise at least one generic order preference, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 90 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 90.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 91 in view of Keiser and Gutterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 91 includes the feature of receiving input from the user modifying at least one of the default values to a desired value, in combination with the features of claim 90. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 90 in combination with the features of claim 90. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 91.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 92 in view of Keiser and Gutterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 92 includes the feature of submitting an order for execution based on information in the order placement window, in combination with the features of claim 90. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 92 in combination with the features of claim 90. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 92.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 93 in view of Keiser and Gutterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 93 includes the feature of

sending an acknowledgement to the user upon execution of the order, in combination with the features of claim 90. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 93 in combination with the features of claim 90. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 93.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 94 in view of Keiser and Gutterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 94 includes the feature of receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference comprises providing a web page to the user, wherein the web page comprises controls that allow the user to enter at least one generic security order preference, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 94 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 94.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 95 for the same rational as given for claim 81. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 95 includes the features of receiving input comprising at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security; storing at least one security-specific order preference in a memory; and automatically using at least one security-specific order as a default value in response to the user placing an order for at least one security for which at least one security-specific order preference has been stored, in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons cited above in regards to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 94 in combination with the features of claim 81. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 94.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 96 in view of Keiser and Gutterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 96 includes the feature of receiving input comprising at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises presenting a security-specific order preferences window to the user, wherein the security-specific order preferences window comprises one or more user interface elements that

allow the user to specify at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 96 in combination with the features of claim 95.

Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 96.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 97 for the same rational as given for claim 84. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 97 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default number of shares of at least one security to be traded during a transaction, in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reason cited above with respect to claim 84, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 97 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 97.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 98 in view of Keiser and Guterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 95 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default dollar amount of at least one security to be traded during a transaction, in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 98 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 98.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 99 for the same rationale as that given for claim 85. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 99 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default limit price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 85, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 99 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 99.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 100 for the same rationale as that given for claim 86. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 100 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default trailing stop price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 86, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 100 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 100.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 101 for the same rationale as that given for claim 87. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 101 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default stop loss price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 87, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 101 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 101.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 102 for the same rationale as that given for claim 88. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 102 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default stop loss price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 88, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 102 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 102.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 103 for the same rationale as that given for claim 89. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 103 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default lot indicator to be used for transactions of at least one security, in

combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 89, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 103 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 103.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 104 in view of Keiser and Guterman. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 104 includes the feature of presenting an order placement window to the user, wherein the order placement window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to override one or more of the security-specific order preferences, in combination with the features of claim 95. The Office Action asserts that Guterman teaches this feature. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the combination of Guterman and Keiser fails to teach or suggest the features in claim 104 in combination with the features of claim 95. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 104.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 106 for the same rationale as that given for claim 82. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 106 includes the feature of receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference comprises presenting a generic security order preferences window to the user, wherein the generic security order preferences window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to specify at least one generic security order preference for securities for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 106 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 106.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 107 for the same rationale as that given for claim 83. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 107 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a number of shares to be used as a default if no security-specific default number of shares is defined for a security, in

combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 107 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 107.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 108 for the same rationale as that given for claim 84. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 108 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a dollar amount of a transaction to be used as a default if no security-specific default dollar amount is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 108 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 108.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 109 for the same rationale as that given for claim 85. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 109 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a limit price to be used as a default if no security-specific default limit price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 109 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 109.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 110 for the same rationale as that given for claim 87. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 110 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a trailing stop price to be used as a default if no security-specific default trailing stop price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the

features in claim 110 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 110.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 111 for the same rationale as that given for claim 87. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 111 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a stop loss price to be used as a default if no security-specific default stop loss price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 111 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 111.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 112 for the same rationale as that given for claim 88. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 112 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a lot indicator to be used as a default if no security-specific default lot indicator is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 112 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 112.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 113 for the same rationale as that given for claim 89. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 113 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a limit price indicator to be used as a default if no security-specific default limit price indicator is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 113 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 113.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 114. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The Office Action states “Keiser teaches the system of claim 105, wherein the computer network comprises the internet.” Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 114 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 114.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 115 for the same rationale as that given for claim 90. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 115 includes the feature program instructions are further executable to present an order placement window to the user; prompt the user to enter a security symbol of a security to be traded; present order preferences received from the user in the order preferences window as default values, wherein if no security-specific order preferences have been received from the user for the security to be traded, then order preferences presented comprises at least one generic order preference, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 115 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 115.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 116 for the same rationale as that given for claim 91. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 116 includes the feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to receive input from the user modifying at least one of the default values to a desired value, in combination with the features of claim 115. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 115, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 116 in combination with the features of claim 115. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 116.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 117 for the same rationale as that given for claim 92. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 117 includes the

feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to submit an order for execution based on information in the order placement window, in combination with the features of claim 115. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 115, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 117 in combination with the features of claim 115. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 117.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 118 for the same rationale as that given for claim 93. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 118 includes the feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to send an acknowledgement to the user upon execution of the order, in combination with the features of claim 115. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 115, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 118 in combination with the features of claim 115. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 118.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 119 for the same rationale as that given for claim 94. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 117 includes the feature wherein receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference comprises providing a web page to the user, wherein the web page comprises controls that allow the user to enter at least one generic security order preference, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 119 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 119.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 120 for the same rationale as that given for claim 95. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 120 includes the feature the program instructions are further executable to receive input comprising at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security; store at least one security-specific order preference in at least one memory; and automatically use at least one security-specific order

as a default value in response to the user placing an order for at least one security for which at least one security-specific order preference has been stored, in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81 and 105, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 120 in combination with the features of claim 105. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 120.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 121 for the same rationale as that given for claim 96. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 121 includes the feature wherein receiving input comprising at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises presenting a security-specific order preferences window to the user, wherein the security-specific order preferences window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to specify at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 121 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 121.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 122 for the same rationale as that given for claim 97. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 122 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default number of shares of at least one security to be traded during a transaction, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 122 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 122.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 123 for the same rationale as that given for claim 98. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 123 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises

a default dollar amount of at least one security to be traded during a transaction, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 123 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 123.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 124 for the same rationale as that given for claim 99. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 124 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default limit price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 124 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 124.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 125 for the same rationale as that given for claim 100. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 125 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default trailing stop price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 125 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 125.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 126 for the same rationale as that given for claim 101. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 126 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default stop loss price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 126 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 126.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 127 for the same rationale as that given for claim 102. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 127 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default lot indicator to be used for transactions of at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 127 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 127.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 128 for the same rationale as that given for claim 103. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 128 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default limit price indicator for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 128 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 128.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 129. No specific rationale for the rejection was provided. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 129 includes the feature of program instructions that are executable to present an order placement window to the user, wherein the order placement window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to override one or more of the security-specific order preferences, in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 128 in combination with the features of claim 120. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 129.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 130. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The Office Action states “Keiser further teaches , a carrier medium to perform the independent steps of claim 131-133 in col. 8, lines29-34. This independent claim

is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 81.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

Amended claim 130 recites a combination of features that include receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference; storing at least one generic security order preference in a memory; and automatically using at least one generic security order preference as a default value in response to a user placing an order for at least one security for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined.

Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in amended claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 127.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 131 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 82. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 131 includes the feature of wherein receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference comprises presenting a generic security order preferences window to the user, wherein the generic security order preferences window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to specify at least one generic security order preference for securities for which a security-specific order preference has not been defined, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 131 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 131.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 132 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 83. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 132 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a number of shares to be used as a default if no security-specific default number of shares is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in

claim 132 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 132.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 133 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 84. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 133 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a dollar amount of a transaction to be used as a default if no security-specific default dollar amount is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 133 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 133.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 134 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 85 and 109. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 134 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a limit price to be used as a default if no security-specific default limit price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 85 and 109, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 134 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 134.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 135 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 86 and 110. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 135 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a trailing stop price to be used as a default if no security-specific default trailing stop price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 86 and 110, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 135 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 135.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 136 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 87 and 111. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 136 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a stop loss price to be used as a default if no security-specific default stop loss price is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 87 and 111, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 136 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 136.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 137 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 88 and 112. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 137 includes the feature of wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a lot indicator to be used as a default if no security-specific default lot indicator is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 88 and 112, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 137 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 137.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 138 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 89 and 113. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 138 includes the feature wherein at least one generic security order preference comprises a limit price indicator to be used as a default if no security-specific default limit price indicator is defined for a security, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 89 and 113, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 138 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 138.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 139 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 90 and 115. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 139 includes the feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to implement:

presenting an order placement window to the user; prompting the user to enter a security symbol of a security to be traded; presenting order preferences received from the user in the order preferences window as default values, wherein if no security-specific order preferences have been received from the user for the security to be traded, then order preferences presented comprises at least one generic order preference, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 90 and 115, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 139 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 139.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 140 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 91 and 116. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 140 includes the feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to implement receiving input from the user modifying at least one of the default values to a desired value, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 91 and 116, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 140 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 140.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 141 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 92 and 117. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 141 includes the feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to implement submitting an order for execution based on information in the order placement window, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 92 and 117, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 141 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 141.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 142 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 93 and 118. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 142

includes the feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to implement sending an acknowledgement to the user upon execution of the order, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 93 and 118, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 142 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 142.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 143 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 94 and 119. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 143 includes the feature wherein receiving input comprising at least one generic security order preference comprises providing a web page to the user, wherein the web page comprises controls that allow the user to enter at least one generic security order preference, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 94 and 119, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 143 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 143.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 144 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 95 and 120. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 144 includes the feature of wherein the program instruction are executable to implement: receiving input comprising at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security; storing at least one security-specific order preference in a memory; and automatically using at least one security-specific order as a default value in response to the user placing an order for at least one security for which at least one security-specific order preference has been stored, in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 95 and 120, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 144 in combination with the features of claim 130. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 144.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 145 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claim 96 and 121. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 145 includes the feature of wherein receiving input comprising at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises presenting a security-specific order preferences window to the user, wherein the security-specific order preferences window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to specify at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claim 81, 96 and 121, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 145 in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 145.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 146 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 84, 97 and 122. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 146 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default number of shares of at least one security to be traded during a transaction, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 84, 97 and 122, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 146 in combination with the features of claim 144.

Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 146.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 147 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 98 and 123. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 147 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default number of shares of at least one security to be traded during a transaction, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 98 and 123, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 147 in combination with the features of claim 144.

Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 147.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 148 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 85, 99 and 124. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 148 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default limit price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 85, 99 and 124, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 148 in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 148.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 149 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 86, 100 and 125. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 149 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default trailing stop price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 86, 100 and 125, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 149 in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 149.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 150 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 87, 101 and 126. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 150 includes the feature of wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default stop loss price for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 87, 101 and 126, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 150 in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 150.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 151 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 88, 102 and 127. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 151 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one

security comprises a default lot indicator to be used for transactions of at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 88, 102 and 127, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 151 in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 151.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 152 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 89, 103 and 128. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 152 includes the feature wherein at least one security-specific order preference for at least one security comprises a default limit price indicator for at least one security, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 89, 103 and 128, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 152 in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 152.

The office action further included a rejection of claim 153 using a similar rationale cited in regard to claims 90, 104 and 129. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 153 includes the feature wherein the program instructions are further executable to implement: presenting an order placement window to the user, wherein the order placement window comprises one or more user interface elements that allow the user to override one or more of the security-specific order preferences, in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the same reasons cited with respect to claims 81, 90, 104 and 129, the cited art does not teach or suggest the features in claim 153 in combination with the features of claim 144. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 153.

For at least the reasons cited above, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and that the combination of Keiser and Guttermann fail to teach or suggest the combination of features found in claims 81-153. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejections on these grounds.

Additional Comments

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees have been omitted or if any additional fees are required, please charge those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5226-00600/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric B. Meyertons
Reg. No. 43,876

Attorney for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: 12-21-04